DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 295 CG 012 565

AUTHOR McDonald, Gerald W.
TITLE Determinants of Adolescent Perceptions of Maternal and Paternal Power in the Family.
PUB DATE Oct 77
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council on Family Relations (San Diego, California, October 12-15, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; Education; Employment; *Family Relationship; *Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Role; *Perception; *Power Structure; Religious Factors; Research Projects; Social Class
IDENTIFIERS *Resource Theory

ABSTRACT

A social power framework is utilized to locate those variables that influence adolescent perceptions of power in the parental unit. The variables are categorized as parental resources, family resources, family size, adolescents' religiosity, and adolescent demographic factors. A major focus of the study is to test the viability of resource theory for explaining adolescent perceptions of parental power. A purposive subsample (N=296) of high school adolescents was obtained and a self-report methodology was employed. Regression analyses support the utility of a resource theory approach. In addition, a number of other variables evidence a degree of strength, particularly adolescents' religiosity. A major finding is that those potential determinant variables taken together are less influential for adolescent perceptions of maternal power than paternal power. Possible explanations are explored. It is also demonstrated that parental power perceptions are not sex-linked for adolescents and same-sex parents but are found to occur in a similar manner with both parents for male and female adolescents. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154295

DETERMINANTS OF ADOLESCENT PERCEPTIONS OF MATERNAL AND PATERNAL POWER IN THE FAMILY*

by

Gerald W. McDonald**

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G.W. McDonald

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

*Data for this project were collected in the Spring, 1976. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations in San Diego, California in October, 1977. I would like to express my appreciation to F. Ivan Nye, Marie W. Osmond, and Candace West for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

**Department of Sociology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306.

CG012565

DETERMINANTS OF ADOLESCENT PERCEPTIONS

OF MATERNAL AND PATERNAL POWER IN THE FAMILY

Historically, the concept of social power has been widely used in the study of sociological and social psychological phenomena. A predominant model of social power adopted during the last two decades has been the theoretical framework put forth by French and Raven (1959) and subsequently elaborated by Raven (1965). Family sociologists have employed this social power framework in investigations of the general domain of family power (Cromwell and Olson, 1975), as well as the more delineated areas of conjugal power (Hallenbeck, 1966; Raven, et al., 1975; Rollins and Bahr, 1976) and parental power (Smith, 1970; Rollins and Thomas, 1975; McDonald, 1977b). However, investigations of power processes in the family, especially with regard to parent-child relationships, have generally regarded power as an independent variable with research focusing on the impact of power upon such dependent variables as child compliance and influence (Smith, 1970), parent-youth conflict (Edwards and Brauburger, 1973; Ihinger, 1975), and parental identification (Bowerman and Bahr, 1974; McDonald, 1977b). An exception is Blood and Wolfe's (1960) formulation of a resource theory of conjugal decision-making, which has been extended (Hoffman, 1960; Heer, 1963a, 1963b; Rodman, 1967, 1972; Centers, et al., 1971; Burr, et al., 1977) to investigate the determinants of conjugal power in the family. However, this framework has not been incorporated into studies of parental power. In this paper parental power is treated as a dependent variable in attempting to locate those independent variables that determine adolescent perceptions of parental power for each parent. As such, the basic propositions of Blood and Wolfe's (1960) resource theory are tested, as are religiosity and selected theoretically

relevant demographic variables of the family and the adolescent, within a social power framework.

Social Power and Parental Power

Though the abstract nature of the social power concept has eluded precise definition, including the French and Raven (1959) framework, Smith (1970) observes general agreement on two basic aspects of definition:

> "1) social power is a person's potential for exerting a force toward change in another person; 2) social power is not based simply upon a quality, or qualities, possessed by the powerful person; it is determined in a majority of cases, by complex conditions governing the interdependence of individuals in a social relationship" (p. 861).

Thus, social power can be seen as not only an interactional phenomenon but also a situational and socio-emotional one. As such, family relationships provide a specific context for the study of social power. The family, as a type of small group (Parsons and Bales, 1955) has superordinate-subordinate relationships, especially with respect to parent-child relationships and, thus, evidences interpersonal power differentials. Further, the family functions within a unique situational milieu while also having a socio-cultural affective history.

Parental power, then, can be conceptualized as a special case of social power and is defined, in this study, as the ability of one or both parents to influence or control the adolescent's behaviors and/or opinions.[1] In addition, parental power is recognized as a perceptual phenomenon, and thus is not independent of the perception of the individuals in the social interaction (Rollins and Bahr, 1976). The French and Raven (1959) concept of power involves primarily "the willingness of one party to be influenced by the other and his

(sic) perception of the influencing one" (Hallenbeck, 1966:203).

As Smith (1977) observes with respect to the variable of parental authority similarly, parental power not only varies from one family to another but also varies within families, from one parent-child relationship to another. Thus, power relationships differ according to the specific parent and the specific child in that particular role relationship. Families with several offspring have a large number of differential power relationships of a dyadic nature. Coalitional power processes in the family (Ihinger, 1975; McDonald, 1977a) dictate an even larger array of power relationships which can easily become multitudinous and empirically cumbersome. In this research the focus is upon dyadic parent-adolescent relationships, with concentration upon the adolescent's perception of power of the father and the mother separately. The dyadic nature of this research, then, does not empirically examine coalitional processes involving both parents, siblings, or parents-offspring, though the existence of such processes does not go unrecognized.

The Multidimensionality of Parental Power

The concept of social power has often been found to be unwieldy in empirical research as a result of its abstract and rather nebulous nature. This is particularly the case in research investigating power processes in the family (Turk, 1975). One of the major problems which has, fortunately, become less prevalent in recent research, perhaps as a result of the theoretical and methodological issues raised by Olson (1969), Safilios-Rothschild (1970), Turk and Bell (1972), Cromwell and Olson (1975), Rollins and Bahr (1976), McDonald (1977a) and others, is the unidimensional usage of the power concept. As Olson, et al. (1975:236) observe, "Power is an abstract and complex construct, composed of

multidimensional concepts . . . An advance in the utility of the construct requires lodging it in a more abstract and analytical level, while undergirding it with a more elaborate and multidimensional language."

French and Raven (1959) recognized the multidimensional nature of social power and explicated five dimensions, or bases, of social power; 1) reward power -- based on the ability of the person possessing power to provide rewards for the persons influenced; 2) coercive power -- based on the powerful one's ability to mediate punishment for the person influenced; 3) legitimate power -- based on the influenced one's belief that the powerful person has the right to control his/her behavior or opinions; 4) expert power -- based on the influenced person's perception of superior knowledge and skill in the powerful person; 5) referent power -- based on the influenced one's feeling of oneness, or desire for such an identity with the powerful person. This conceptual scheme has been subsequently modified, however.

Smith (1970) combined the reward and coercive power dimensions into a single power dimension, termed "outcome-control" power, based on the argument that reward and coercive power, though opposite, appear to be symmetrically related along the same dimension of influencing or controlling positive and negative reinforcement. McDonald (1977b) reconceptualized referent power as a comparative referent rather than a normative referent; thus defining it as an established predisposition on the part of the influenced person to turn to the powerful person for guidance and/or advice. Referent power is then differentiated from the related, but separate, concept of parental identification.

Although French and Raven (1959) distinguish these bases of power as being "qualitatively different," the differing power bases are not conceptualized by French and Raven as being totally independent dimensions of

social power. The different bases of power are interrelated, or over-lapping, and their ranges vary in broadness with respect to their interrelationships. In general, French and Raven argue that referent power has the broadest range, followed by legitimate, expert and outcome-control power, respectively. This appears supported by the studies of Raven, et al., (1975) investigating conjugal power and influence and McDonald's (1977b) analysis of the relationships of parental power and adolescent's parental identification. The specific range of each dimension is dependent to some degree upon the interactional, situational, and socio-emotional context of the power relationships. However, as Rollins and Thomas (1975:40) comment, "It is assumed that these bases of power function in an additive manner in increasing or decreasing social power."

These four dimensions, or bases, of parental power, then, form the theoretical bases for parental exercise of power over offspring, and perceptions of parental power, in the family. In attempting to locate the determinants of adolescents' perceptions of general parental power, this research will focus upon the more general variables of paternal and maternal power. However, each of the dimensions is measured in operationalizing parental power, and their summation is taken as the indicator of degree of parental power for each parent.

Resources in A Parental Power Context

French and Raven (1959) suggested several factors contributing to the development of social power bases in power relationships. In a discussion of the social power model within a marital, or conjugal, power context, Hallenbeck (1966) more specifically delineated the sources of conjugal power differentials. Her analysis incorporated the Blood and Wolfe (1960) "resource theory" of conjugal decision-making into the conjugal power, as social power, framework.

From a resource theory perspective ". . . the power to make decisions stems primarily from the resources which the individual can provide to meet the needs of his marriage partner and upgrade his (sic) decision-making skill," (Blood and Wolfe, 1960:44). The spouse, then, who brings the most resources into the marriage has the most power. These resources, according to Blood and Wolfe, are primarily economic in nature, with the most important resources being those of occupation, education, income, and to a lesser extent, social participation. The Blood and Wolfe Detroit study (1960) demonstrated the importance of these economic resources in their finding that the "power" of the husband, as perceived by the wife, was a direct function of the husband's socio-economic status. Though the Detroit study was in fact focused on conjugal decision-making rather than the more abstract power concept (McDonald, 1977a), this resource theory has had wide utility for studies of conjugal relationships.

However, resource theory as formulated by Blood and extended by Rodman (1972) goes beyond the relationship between the absolute amount of resources of the husband and wife and their degree of marital power. Though it has not always been recognized and utilized in empirical investigations of resource theory, the major focus of the theoretical formulation is on comparative resources. Blood and Wolfe (1960:12) state that "the sources of power in so intimate a relationship as marriage must be sought in the comparative resources which the husband and wife bring into the marriage . . ." Thus the major concern of the resource theory is the distribution of those stated resources within the conjugal unit. In this regard, Rodman (1972:55) comments:

> ". . . a few studies report data on marital power in relation to the comparative status of husbands and wifes. Comparative educa-

> tional status is ordinarily used, but some studies also report data by comparative income, occupational involvement, and organizational participation. These data indicate that comparative status is an important variable -- generally, spouses with higher relative status or with greater work or organizational participation have more power than comparable spouses with lower status or participation. . . the relationship between comparative status and power is unmistakable."

Richmond (1976: 264) concurs in arguing that ". . . it is important to consider the strength of the wife's resources relative to those of her husband . . . if we are to understand the total power structure of the family."

In a similar manner, resource theory does not regard power in only an individualistic sense, but considers the differential power of spouses. The concern with comparative resources, according to Blood and Wolfe (1960: 13), then, entails an investigation of " . . . the comparative competence of the two partners and their relative contributions to marriage, as explanations for the variations that occur between couples' balance of power."

The question is raised, then, of the worth of resource theory for explanations of the locus of parental power in the family. It appears tenable that the status of the parent, with respect to the possession of these resources and the distribution of resources in the parental unit, greatly contributes to adolescent perceptions of each parent's power as well as the power relationship between parents. As demonstrated by Hallenbeck (1966), resource theory is congruent with the French and Raven (1959) framework, though never having been systematically tested in studies of social power processes. However, several studies have demonstrated the usefulness of resource theory in locating these significant factors determining the distribution and strength of social power in the modern American family.

Potential Determinants of Adolescent Perceptions of Parental Power

Resource theory generates several potential determinants of perceptions of parental power by the adolescent, which are typologized in this study as: 1)

parental occupational prestige status; 2) parental educational status; 3) employment status of the mother, and 4) family resources, including family social class and estimated family income. The parental occupational and educational variables are utilized both in the absolute and the comparative context to more exhaustively explore the potential of resource theory for perceived parental power. Family social class and estimated family income are considered as general family resource variables. Further, several other variables have been identified in the literature which possibly influence parental power perceptions: these include 1) religiosity; 2) family size; and 3) adolescent demographic status.

Resource Variables

1) Parental occupational prestige status: several studies (Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Bowerman and Elder, 1964; Michel, 1967; Centers, et al., 1971; Gecas, 1971; Bahr, et al., 1974; Buehler, et al., 1974) have demonstratrd positive relationships between husband and/or wife occupational prestige status and various conjugal power measures. It is hypothesized, then, that 1) in those families in which both parents are employed full time, that occupational prestige status of the father and mother is positively associated with adolescent perceptions of paternal and maternal power, respectively; and 2) the parents' comparative occupational prestige status is positively associated with adolescents' perceived comparative parental power, i.e., the higher the father's occupational prestige status compared to the mother the higher his power relative to the mother in the parental unit as perceived by the adolescent and vice versa;

2) Parental educational status: educational status is commonly viewed as an important resource in a wide realm of social participation and is often a major indicator of one's competence and knowledge. Similarly, within the

family, educational status has consistently correlated with a broad range of family variables. Blood and Wolfe (1960), Komarovsky (1962), Bowerman and Elder (1964) Blood (1967), Buric and Zecevic (1967), Michel (1967), Lupri(1969), Centers et al. (1971) and Bahr et al. (1974), have found husband and wife educational level an important indicator of conjugal power. The hypotheses then, are: 1) father's and mother's educational statuses are positively related to adolescent perceptions of paternal and maternal power respectively; and 2) the parents' comparative educational status is positively associated with adolescent's perceived comparative power, i.e., the higher the father's educational status compared to the mother the higher his power relative to the mother in the parental unit as perceived by the adolescent and vice versa.

3) Mother's employment status: Many women in the family, of course, do not work at a paid job but focus exclusively upon the homemaker role or engage in non-paid activities. However, the proportion of employed wives and mothers has steadily increased in the last several decades with 42% of all wives working at paid jobs in 1974 (Bane, 1976). From a resource theory perspective, it would be expected that employed mothers would have a higher degree of conjugal and parental power in the family. Bowerman and Elder (1964), Bahr, et al. (1974), and Buehler, et al. (1974) have evidenced this with respect to adolescent perceptions of conjugal power, though Centers, et al. (1971) found no relationship between wife's employment status and her conjugal power. The employment status of the mother is hypothesized, following the more prevalent research findings: 1) to be positively associated with adolescent perceptions of maternal power; 2) to be negatively associated with

adolescent's perceived comparative power, i.e , the employed mother should have more power relative to the father than the non-employed mother;

4) Family resources: The conceptualization of family social class and estimated family income as family resources stems from the notion that the family socio-economic status, and contingent resources, possibly functions to influence adolescent perceptions of both paternal and maternal power apart from the individual resources of the father and the mother. As such, these variables could be taken as resources of the parental unit. Though family income and family social class are not variables independent of each other, or of the aforementioned variables, both will be utilized herein as they are generally taken as separate indicators of family status. Estimated family income is specifically included following Oppenheimer's (1977:397) observation that "A wife's earnings will undoubtedly affect the general status of the family and not just its economic position because the wife's earnings will probably modify the family consumption patterns. . ." Social class has been positively associated with conjugal power in several investigations (Heer, 1958; Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Hoffman, 1960; Bowerman and Elder, 1964), and is logically incorporated in the resource theory approach to power. However, it is perhaps less obvious with respect to adolescent perceptions of parental power, as high social class of the family may, in fact, indicate a more deliberate equalitarian distribution of power in the family. This is, of course, an empirical question. In accord with a resource theory, the hypothesis is posited that family social class and estimated family income are positively associated with adolescent perceptions of paternal and maternal power.

Religiosity

One of the most prevalent indicators of adherence to traditionalistic values is the variable of religiosity. Traditionalism would be expected to be highly related to power processes in parent-child relationships as the child's orientation to parental authority and respect for parental wishes, demands, advice, etc., should strongly influence the power differentials in the family. Pitts (1964) maintains that religious commitment functions in families to endorse parental authority. He states (1964:115) that "the contribution of the church is to reinforce parental dominance over the children."

Religiosity is included, thus, to allow an assessment of possible socio-cultural determinants that extend beyond parental resources. Rodman (1972) has demonstrated, with regard to conjugal power, that the distribution of power is not only a function of the comparative resources of husband and wife, but results from the interaction of comparative resources and the cultural or subcultural expectations about the distribution of conjugal power. In differentiating power and authority, Blood and Wolfe state that family authority patterns are prescribed by the society at large from the social norms. They ask, "if authority patterns and personal resources both influence the balance of power are they equally important?" (1960:13). Richmond (1976) indicates, however, that the concept of normative influence has received little attention in research on husband-wife resource theory. Religiosity can be utilized as one basic indicator of the normative structure of authority relationships in families, thus allowing a comparison of the relative influence of parental resources and normative structure.

In their test of Rodman's theory of conjugal power, Burr, et al. (1977)

conclude that, "the clearest finding was that the normative structure was much more important than resources in accounting for the variance in power" (p. 513). However, the Burr, et al., sample purposefully consisted almost totally of members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (Mormon). Further, student perceptions of their normative beliefs about power distribution in marriage were utilized as indicators of normative structure. In contrast, this study focuses on religiosity as an external source of influence upon adolescent perceptions of parental power across the range of adolescent religious involvement.[2] Thus, religiosity is predicted to correlate positively with perceptions of paternal and maternal power in the family.

With respect to the comparative power of the father and mother, religiosity should further reinforce the traditionalistic patriarchal family system in which the father has more normative prescribed power than the mother. It is hypothesized, then, that religiosity is positively associated with comparative parental power such that the higher the religiosity of the adolescent, the more he/she perceives the father has having power relative to the mother.

Family and Adolescent Demographic Variables

1. Family size: The variable of family size of the nuclear unit has not been investigated in studies of power processes in the family. It would seem, however, that larger families would lessen each child's contact with parents, or, at least, increase the probability of sibling relationships substituting for parental relationships. In addition, the prevalence of coalitional formation among siblings would argue for the adolescent's perception of the lessened parental power of each parent. A negative relationship is predicted for the

variables of family size and adolescent perception of paternal and maternal power, following this argument.

2. Adolescent demographic status: The variables of age, birth order, number of older brothers and number of older sisters of adolescents are included as potential determinants of their perceptions of parental power. Bahr, et al., (1974) have demonstrated that perceptions of conjugal power differ by age, while Smith (1977:155) summarized the empirical evidence in stating that ". . . older offspring are more autonomous and independent from parents than younger offspring." Thus, it is predicted that age of the adolescent is negatively related to perceptions of paternal and maternal power.

Finally, the position of the adolescent among siblings and the distribution of siblings in the family could be expected to affect the dependent variable of this study. Though Smith (1977) found no significant relationships between birth order and perceptions of parental authority, the lack of empirical utilization of birth order in power studies demands a further testing for potential relationships. An argument, similar to that put forth with respect to family size, could be formulated that the larger number of older siblings the larger number of potential resources in the family for the adolescent. Perhaps older siblings are perceived as being capable of providing more expertise and guidance in areas of direct concern to the younger siblings such as heterosexual relationships, school problems, circumvention of parental control, etc. In addition, parents' use of older siblings as "surrogate parents" with delegated authority over younger siblings possibly generates a dissemination of power processes and resultant power relationships in the family. In a more specific manner, older siblings of the same sex as the specific parent under study may provide many of

those power resources which would otherwise be provided by that parent. From this perspective, it is hypothesized that the larger the number of older brothers, the lower the perceived paternal power and the larger the number of older sisters, the lower the perceived maternal power of the adolescent.

Methodology

Sample

The research questionnaire was administered to all high school students (grades 9-12) in attendance on the date of questionnaire administration in a small Alabama town, population approximately 8,000, during April, 1976. Data were collected for 440 students, from which a purposive subsample was taken to include only those adolescents unmarried, from intact families, and living at home. The purposive subsample was selected to exercise partial control over variables of "dependence" and "alternatives," as formulated by Thibaut and Kelley (1959) and Emerson (1962) in an extension of the French and Raven (1959) model. This procedure was taken to ensure the adolescent's relative dependency on the parental resources and to limit the adolescent's source of alternative resources.

Of the 440 questionnaires administered, 144 or 33% had to be discarded due to incompleteness or failure to meet the specified characteristics of the study. Thus a final subsample was obtained of 296 subjects: 147 males and 149 females.

Measurement

The research questionnaire consisted of two distinct sections: 20 demographic items and 46 Likert-type questions tapping the different parental power dimensions. The demographic items were included to address the previously stated research

questions. The variables of occupational and educational prestige status of each parent, as well as family social class, are constructed following the Hollingshead (1957) Two Factor Index of Social Position formulation;[3] the occupational and educational variables consisting of seven categories and family social class including lower, upper-lower, lower-middle, upper-middle and upper class categories. Employment status of the mother is dichotomized into employed-non-employed and treated as a dummy variable in data analysis. Religiosity is operationalized as the frequency of church attendance, with high religiosity defined as more than once a month, following Reiss (1965).[4]

Comparative parental occupational and educational prestige status are tabulated by subtracting the father's occupational and educational prestige levels from the mother's occupational and educational prestige levels, respectively. Only families in which the mother is employed full-fime (N = 147) are included in data analysis of occupational relationships for mothers and the comparative occupational status variable.

Adolescent perception of parental power is measured by a modified version of Smith's (1970) parental power instrument. The relevant dimensions of the general parental power variables are distinguished in the questionnaire for each parent, while also generating a cumulative indicator of adolescent's perception of general paternal and maternal power. A set of four questionnaire items, two positive and two negative in direction, was utilized to measure each of these variables. The items are of Likert-format, each with a non-verbal seven-point response from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

Outcome-control power is measured by focusing upon the parental control of economic resources, perceptions of decision-making in the parental unit, and the

perceived strength of parental rewards and punishers. Referent power is measured by the adolescent's predisposition to turn to the parent for guidance and advice. Legitimate power is measured by the adolescent's perception of the parent's right or authority to exercise power, and expert power focuses upon the adolescent's perception of parental competence and knowledge, in the heterosexual and educational areas of adolescent life. Each of the four parental power dimensions is operationalized, then, as the resulting values obtained by the summation of the four Likert-type items. Similarly, parental power is operationalized as the summation of the four power dimensions. The resulting power component values are broken down and specified for both father and mother, with a possible range of 16-112 for each parent. The perceived comparative power variable is obtained by subtracting the father's perceived power score from the mother's perceived power score.

Data are presented separately for fathers and mothers. In addition, relationships among the variables are tabulated separately for male and female adolescents. The question of sex difference in power processes in the family has remained an area of debate (Buehler, et al., 1974; Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974; McDonald, 1977b) and it thus appears necessary to clearly explicate similarities and differences by sex in family processes for the generation of more empirically grounded theory in this domain of investigation.

Findings

Determinant Variables of Adolescent Perceptions of Parental Power

Table 1 presents the zero-order correlation matrix by sex of adolescent for the determinant variables with the variables of adolescent perceptions of paternal power, maternal power and comparative parental power. All relation-

ships are tested at the .05 level of significance. With respect to paternal power, Table 1 indicates that the educational and occupational prestige status variables of the father are significantly related to perceptions of father's power for both male and female adolescents. Father's educational status is seen to have a somewhat stronger relationship than his occupational status with the correlation coefficients being .368 for males and .353 for females. The findings are generally consistent, then, with this modified resource theory and existent research investigating resources in conjugal power relationships.

Of the family resource variables, family social class is a major determinant for both sexes, with coefficients of .262 for males and .378 for females.

(Table 1 about here)

However, estimated family income is significant for female adolescents only = .202).

The variable of family size differs in strength by sex of adolescent, evidencing no significant relationship for males, but demonstrating a negative association for females between family size and perceptions of paternal power (r = -.138). Religiosity is a significant variable for perceptions of paternal power with males only (r = .202), though showing a degree of strength at .131 with females (the coefficient is at the cutting point of statistical significance at $p < .056$.

Of the adolescent demographic variables, only the number of older brothers is a significant factor, being negatively correlated with the paternal power variables for both sexes, and thus supporting the stated hypotheses.

Determinant Variables of Adolescent Perceptions of Maternal Power

The relationships of similar variables with adolescent perceptions of

maternal power can also be observed in Table 1. All maternal resource variables, with the exception of mother's occupational prestige status (n = 74), are seen to be significantly related to female perceptions of maternal power. The mother's employment status is correlated at .178 with females' perceived maternal power. Similarly, mother's educational status is significantly related to female adolescent's perceived maternal power. Evidently, then, a significant factor influencing adolescent females perception of the parental power of the mother is whether or not the mother is employed outside the home, with little regard for the prestige status of her occupation.

For male adolescents, the only maternal resource significantly impacting upon perceptions of maternal power is the mother's educational status (r = .242). Neither of the maternal occupational variables appear salient with respect to males' perceived maternal power. In addition, the significant resource variable relationships are less strong for both sexes for mother than for father.

Family social class is the only family resource variable to operate as a significant determinant of perceived maternal power, being positively related for females (r = .180). No similar relationship is indicated with perceived maternal power for males. Estimated family income is shown to be minimally influential in both cases.

Religiosity is the variable having the strongest relationship to perceptions of maternal power, and it is significant for both male (r = .328) and female (r = .256) adolescents. Though it was also a significant variable for the father's perceived power by males, religiosity is more strongly related to mother's perceived power for both sexes. None of the adolescent or family demographic variables are related to perceptions of maternal power for either

sex. It is evident, then, at the zero-order correlation level, that these potential determinants of parental power, with the exception of religiosity, are weaker with respect to the mother than the father. This is especially the case for males, with only two significant relationships.

Determinant Variables of Adolescent Perceptions of Comparative Parental Power

Table 1 also allows the location of those variables related to shifts in the distribution of parental power in the family as perceived by adolescents. The paternal resource variables can be seen to be positively and significantly associated with the father's perceived power relative to the mother for both males and females. The father's occupational prestige status and educational status are correlated for males at .247 and .283, and for females at .253 and .206, respectively. In contrast, the occupational and educational resources of the mother are systematically non-significantly related to comparative parental power for either sex, with one exception; the mother's employment status is negatively correlated with comparative parental power for males ($r = .176$) indicating that the employed mother increases her power relative to the father as perceived by male adolescents.

With regard to the relationships of the comparative occupational and educational status of the father and mother to the distribution of perceived parental power, the stated hypotheses are generally supported. For male and female adolescents, the higher the education of the father relative to the mother, the more power he is perceived to have comparatively ($r = .310$ for males, $r = .210$ for females). The comparative occupational status of the parents is similarly related to the perceived distribution of parental power for males ($r = .214$). However, the relationship is almost non-existent for

females (r = .062).

Few other variables are found to be systematically related to perceptions of comparative parental power for adolescents of both sexes. Only family social class emerges as significantly related to perceived comparative parental power for male (r = .209) and female (r = .237) adolescents. Religiosity is found to be positively correlated at .171 with the comparative power variable for males. Religiosity is not a significant variable for female adolescents' perceptions of comparative parent power. Lastly, family size is negatively correlated with comparative parental power for females (r = -.140), indicating that for female adolescents the larger the family is, the more parental power of the mother relative to the father.

Thus, in zero-order correlation analysis, the comparative resource theory of parental power is found to have considerable validity though the patterning of relationships diverges at strategic points for both male and female adolescent perceptions of fathers and mothers. Other variables appear less systematically related to perceived comparative parental power.

Multiple Regression of Determinant Variables with Parental Power

Multiple regression analysis was utilized to test the relative effects of selected independent variables upon perceived paternal power, maternal power and comparative parental power for male and female adolescents. Parental educational status was chosen as the indicator of parental resources to be entered into the multiple regression equation. This variable was selected for several reasons: (1) educational status is the most commonly used indicator of resources in family research (Bahr, 1972; Rodman, 1972); (2) parental educational status emerges as the most potent resource variable for predicting adolescent percep-

tions of parental power in the zero-order correlation analysis; (3) the utilization of the maternal occupational status variable would reduce the sample to approximately half that available for the educational variable, since only that proportion of the adolescents' mothers were employed, and (4) problems of multicollinearity (Blalock, 1963; Christ, 1966; Nachmias, 1976) among the resource variables preclude the inclusion of all the parental resource variables in the multiple regression equation. The multicollinearity problem is especially significant in this particular research. High intercorrelations among the independent variables result in large standard errors causing instability in estimates of the true parameters of the variables. Kasadra and Shih (1971:161) state that, in these instances, "Parameter values will tend to vary substantially from sample to sample and, for any given sample, some estimates may be excessively large and even of the incorrect sign, while other substantively important predictors may be eliminated from the model because of statistical insignificance." In their discussion of strategies for dealing with this problem, one proposed solution is to eliminate one or more of the correlated independent variables from the model. This is the strategy followed in this project.

Estimated family income is the family resource variable included in multivariate analysis, as the family social class variable is also demonstrated as being highly intercorrelated with the parental resource variables in the zero-order correlations. Religiosity is employed, as it demonstrated a degree of strength in the zero-order correlations as an indicator of traditional normative structure for parental power perceptions. By the same reasoning, number of older brothers is included in investigating the relative effects of the determinant variables on perceived paternal power. Finally, the employment

status of the mother is included in the location of influential variables for perceived maternal power since it also evidenced significance in female perceptions of maternal power in Table 1, while not suffering from high intercorrelations with the other independent variables.

Table 2, then, presents the multiple regression analyses of the relative influence of these seemingly influential determinant variables for adolescent perceptions of paternal and maternal power respectively. Table 2 shows the unstandardized and standardized betas, F-values, and explained variances resulting from these equations. The standardized betas demonstrate the degree of strength of paternal educational status relative to the other variables. For perceived paternal power, the educational status of the father is the most potent variable for both male and female adolescents. In fact, for female adolescents, paternal educational status is the only variable indicating significance. In contrast, male adolescents indicate all variables, with the exception of the number of older brothers, to be significant determinant variables for perceptions of paternal power. The family resource variable of estimated family income is second in strength to father's educational status, through being negatively related to the dependent variable. Thus, the higher the estimated family income, taking the other variables into account, the lower the

(Table 2 about here)

male adolescents' perceptions of paternal power. Religiosity also operates to determine male paternal power perceptions. In general, the included determinant variables account for considerably more variance in the dependent variable for males (R^2 = .271) than for females (R^2 = .157).

With regard to perceived maternal power, Table 2 indicates a similar

patterning for both male and female adolescents. Again the educational level is a strongly influential variable for both sexes, with the strength of the variable being greater in this instance also for males than females. However, for both sexes, the variable of religiosity comes through as the strongest determinant variable for perceived maternal power. The only other significant variable for the dependent variable is estimated family income which is again negatively correlated with perceived maternal power for male adolescents. The mother's employment status does not appear to be a salient variable in this analysis, although it does have a degree of strength for female perceptions of maternal power. In contrast to the paternal power variables, these determinant variables systematically account for less variance in perceived maternal power for both males (R^2 = .183) and females (R^2 = .126).

Multiple Regression of Determinant Variables with Comparative Parental Power

Multiple regression analysis was also utilized in attempting to locate those independent variables having greatest relative influence upon adolescents' perceptions of the distribution of parental power in the father-mother dyad. Table 3 presents the initial analyses, including the independent variables of

(Table 3 about here)

comparative parental educational status, the employment status of the mother and religiosity in the regression equation. The comparative educational status of the parents is the only variable having a significant independent impact on perceptions of the comparative power of the parents. The variables of mother's employment status and religiosity have little influence upon the independent variable, though the employment status of the mother exercises a degree of influence for males' perceptions of comparative parental power

(B = -.153). Thus, taking these variables into account, the higher the educational status of the father relative to the mother, the greater degree of parental power the father has relative to the mother and vice versa. This relationship is considerably stronger for male adolescents than for female adolescents as is indicated by the unstandardized betas, which allow an assessment of the relative importance of these variables across sex categories (b = 2.378 for females, b = .098 for females), but none significantly alter the patterning of relationships. In this sense, then, the comparative resource theory of parental distribution of power is supported, though most of the variance in the dependent variable is left unexplained.

Discussion

This research was conducted to locate the major determinants of adolescent perceptions of paternal and maternal power in the family. The variables were typologized as parental resources, family resources, religiosity, and family and adolescent demographic status. A major goal was to extend the resource theory of conjugal power into the realm of parental power as perceived by adolescents in the family and to test the viability of such a model. This resource theory of parental power was employed both as an individualistic model, viewing the relationships between paternal and maternal resources and adolescents' perceived paternal and maternal power, and as a comparative model, as Blood and Wolfe (1960) intended, in investigating the relationship between comparative resources of the father and mother and adolescent perceptions of the distribution of parental power in the parental unit. In addition, the influence of parental resources was contrasted with the possible influence of a traditional normative structure upon perceived parental power, in order to

clarify the relative influence of these variables for parental power processes in families.

Basically, the resource theory is found to have strength and viability in explaining adolescent perceptions of parental power, though significant relationships are not evidenced across the board. Differentiations can be located by parent and by sex of adolescent. The occupational prestige status of the father, for instance, functions as a significant variable for both male and female adolescents, whereas the occupational prestige status of the employed mother in the sample is not found to be of any utility for explaining her attributed parental power for offspring of either sex. The employed mother has increased maternal power in female adolescent perceptions, but not in male adolescent perceptions. The strongest and most consistent parental resource emerges as educational status for adolescent perceptions of parental power for both sexes, both positively and significantly related in all instances. Perhaps, educational status is the most potent resource for adolescents in perceiving power of parents since the educational resource of the parent, conceptualized as an indicator of relative knowledge and competency, is a more relevant variable in the internal family unit. The parent has the opportunity to utilize this resource almost continually in family interaction and family goal-achievement, whereas the occupational resources are of greatest import external to the family in the parent's participation in the broader social system.

Similarly, the comparative occupational and educational variables in the parental unit influence how the adolescent perceives the distribution of parental power in the father-mother dyad. The comparative educational status of the

parents is of considerable importance for both male and female adolescents in viewing the distribution of parental power. As was the case with the parent-specific occupational status variable, the comparative occupational status of the parents is found to be influential for male adolescents only. However, when the employment status of the mother is correlated with comparative parental power, rather than the absolute power of the mother, the relationships reverse for male and female adolescents. As previously observed the employed mother is perceived by the female adolescent, but not by the male, to have considerably more power than the nonemployed mother. However, for females, the employment status of the mother is not related to shifts in the distribution of parental power, whereas her employment status is related to parental power shifts for male adolescents, such that the employed mother in the perception of the male gains parental power relative to the father. In other words, female adolescents perceive the employed mother as having more power than the nonemployed mother, but perceive no increase in the employed mother's power relative to the father. On the other hand, male adolescents do not view the employed mother as having more power than the nonemployed mother, but do perceive the employed mother as having increased power relative to the father. Evidently, then, the employment status of the mother lessens, to some degree, the power of the father as perceived by males and, as such, increases the employed mother's comparative power.

The traditional normative definitions of the adolescent, as indicated here by religiosity, are shown to be important for determining how adolescents perceive the degree of power possessed by the parents. As predicted, adolescents indicating high religiosity tend to perceive both parents as having greater power than "non-religious" adolescents. This supports the notion

that religious commitment functions to reinforce perceptions of parental dominance. It could be argued further, that though the perceived power of each parent would increase for religious adolescents, the degree of perceived power of the father would be expected to be substantially higher than that of the mother. This would result from religious endorsement of the traditionalistic norm not only functioning to support parental dominance, but also reinforcing more specifically the legitimate authority of the father relative to the mother, and thus supporting a patriarchal family system. The data indicate that this is in fact the case for males, as highly religious male adolescents perceive the father having increased power relative to the mother. However, this relationship does not hold for female adolescents. For females, the degree of religiosity does not significantly affect their perceptions of the distribution of parental power. In general, it can be concluded that the normative expectations function apart from the parental resources to determine how adolescents perceive power in the parental relationships in the family.

Of the family resource variables, family social class emerges most clearly as an influential variable for adolescent parental power perceptions. However, the operationalization of this variable, following the traditional guidelines of most social research, cast into doubt possible interpretation of this variable. The zero-order correlations allow for the argument that family social class, as utilized herein, should more appropriately be considered another paternal resource. The data are included, however, to allow for a possible clarification of these relationships in future research efforts. Estimated family income does not demonstrate general potency, and its only significant effect is in fact in the opposite direction predicted; that is, for female

adolescents, the higher the estimated family income the less the perceived power of the father. However, the variable does emerge with some strength in multiple regression analysis, as will be discussed below.

The only variable included within the family and adolescent demographic typology to demonstrate a degree of strength is the negative relationship between the number of older brothers and perceived paternal power. This finding for both males and females supports the argument put forth that older brothers, at least, perhaps function as surrogate fathers, taking over some of the paternal functions in the family, and thus, "depriving" the father of some of his attributed power. Whether such "duties" are delegated by the father or actively sought from older brothers by the younger adolescents is unclear. The adolescent may view the father as too far removed from adolescent life to be particularly helpful and, thus, seek the expertise, guidance, and, perhaps, authority of the older siblings. On the other hand, it is possible that the older brother "puts down" the father in many instances, thus lessening the younger adolescent's perceptions of the father's power. Since this resource theory of parental power is seen to be more strongly supported for fathers generally than mothers, the question remains as to whether this process also exists for older sisters and perceived maternal power. Possibly, had more of the relevant maternal resources been tapped, older sisters would also be found to disseminate the power processes in the family. These tentative findings indicate the need for research investigating power processes and power structure among siblings.

Multiple regression analyses further indicate the strength of the educational status resource for perceived parental power with both parents for

both sex offspring. Here, educational status is more influential with fathers than mothers, and the relationships stronger with both parents for male adolescents. Religiosity also operates as an important determinant variable, taking the educational status resource into account, and is, in fact, the stronger variable for adolescents' perceptions of maternal power. Surprisingly, estimated family income is also an important variable for males' perceptions of paternal and maternal power, with relationships being in a negative direction for both parents. With regard to comparative power perceptions, only the comparative educational status variable has any significant degree of strength. This clearly demonstrates the viability of the comparative resource theory for contributing to explanations of perceived distributions of power in the parental unit.

The sex difference in determinants of parental power is probably one of the most important findings of this study. It is important to note that, though sex differences are evident, these differentiations do not typically occur linking sex of parent to sex of adolescent; that is, no patterning occurs for same-sex parents. The differentiations that occur are similar by parent for both sexes and thus, not sex-linked. This further supports earlier research (McDonald, 1977b) involving perceived parental power and parental identification, in which data are presented demonstrating the similarity of perceived power and identificatory relationships for both sexes. These findings also support the hypothesis that power processes in the family are not related to sex-similarity of adolescent and parent. The differences that are found occur in a similar manner with both parents for each sex. The analyses indicate that the determinants of perceived parental power are basically the same

with each parent for male and female adolescents, with the determinants being stronger for males with both parents than females in multivariate analyses.

It can be observed that the potential determinants of perceived parental power taken together are less influential with respect to the mother than the father. The variables specified from resource theory are of a more economic nature, focused on those instrumental activities external to the interactional processes of the family unit, and may thus provide a partial explanation for this phenomenon. Though it remains an empirical question, adolescent perceptions of parental power may also eminate from observations of internal family processes such as the parental division of labor in the family. Though there has been increased participation of women in educational and labor-force activities, and, seemingly, the development of a more equalitarian ideology in conjugal relationships, recent studies (Berheide, et al., 1976; Farkas, 1976) have indicated that there have been few changes in the distribution of household tasks, with women continuing to do most household chores. Berheide, et al., (1976:504-505) conclude that ". . . married women employed outside the home did not typically do a significantly smaller proportion of household work. . . Similarly, education seems to have no impact." This would perhaps explain the findings that mother's employment status is only weakly related, and her occupational prestige status is non-related, to adolescent perceptions of maternal power.

This study did find educational status related to perceived parental power. Educational status possibly affects other noninstrumental parental behaviors which were not included in this study, however. Such noninstrumental activities as nurturance, supportiveness, and other expressive or socio-emotional functions,

may continue to provide major determinants of parents' perceived power. These activities often operate differentially by parent also, with mothers performing the majority of such behaviors, and this possibly explains the lessened potency of the resource determinants of perceived maternal power for male and female adolescents. This could also be an explanation for the lessened perceived power of the father when the adolescent has older brothers, but not the same effects when older sisters for maternal power perceptions. The older brothers may be assuming some of the instrumental resources of the father. Older sisters, perhaps, assume more of the household tasks and other noninstrumental types of behaviors which were not measured in this study. In any case, the probable influence of noninstrumental determinants is indicated by the strength of religiosity as a relevant variable for parental power perceptions.

Though these investigated determinants taken together, and many of those investigated separately, are found to explain a considerable amount of variance in perceived parental power, the larger proportion of variance not accounted for, both at the bivariate and multivariate levels, argues for further investigation of the bases of perceived parental power. Perhaps, the specification and investigation of a wide range of interactional, expressive and socio-emotional variables would more fully explicate the bases of parental power in the family unit. Further analyses are needed in viewing the relationships of these included determinants, as well as those of the noninstrumental dimension, to each of the parental power dimensions, referent power, in order to locate the relative impacts of the determinant variables upon each of these power dimensions. Resource theory may fit more appropriately within one, or some combination, of these dimensions, while not having wide utility to the more broad parental power variable.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Earlier research (McDonald, 1977b) has systematically differentiated the concepts of social power, family power, conjugal power and parental power in an attempt to allay the commonly confused usage of those concepts in family literature.

[2]This closely parallels the utilization of religiosity by Reiss (1965) in his study of determinants of premarital sexual permissiveness.

[3]The construction of the family social class variable, following Hollingshead, utilizes the father's occupational and educational status, excluding possible maternal contributions. Such usage can be partially justified by Oppenheimer's (1977) conclusion that there is little status difference between husbands' and wives' occupations. However, this variable construction should be taken into account in data interpretations of family social class relationships with perceived power. Though frequently used in the social science literature, it could be argued that family social class is, in fact, another paternal resource rather than a family resource.

[4]Though these variables are measured at the ordinal level, the use of interval statistics with ordinal data can be justified following the discussions of Labowitz (1967, 1970, 1971).

Table 1

Zero-order Correlation Matrix for Determinant Variables and Paternal Power Variables by Sex: Males (N = 147) Above the Diagonal, Females (N = 149) Below the Diagonal

VARIABLE	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4	X_5	X_6	X_7	X_8	X_9	X_{10}	X_{11}	X_{12}	X_{13}	X_{14}	X_{15}	Y_1	Y_2	Y_3
X_1 Father's Occupational Prestige Status	---	.526*	.005	.484*	.721*	.475*	.397*	.772*	.460*	.090	.191*	.086	-.042	-.074	-.072	.313*	.053	.247*
X_2 Mother's Occupational Prestige Status[b]	.142*	---	c	-.489*	.341*	.471*	-.071	.374*	.290*	-.276*	.269*	.049	-.134	-.186*	-.038	.241*	.122	.143
X_3 Mother's Employment Status[a]	-.063	c	---	-.074	.060	.170*	-.086	.065	.309*	-.133	.006	.163*	-.051	-.101	-.019	-.123	.049	-.176*
X_4 Comparative Occupational Status	.337*	-.589*	-.181	---	.452*	.003	.477*	.340*	.048	.249*	-.021	.011	.086	.087	.076	.225*	.036	.214*
X_5 Father's Educational Status	.691*	.577*	.047	-.030	---	.553*	.647*	.856*	.461*	-.117	.008	.163*	-.197*	-.070	-.200*	.368*	.108	.283*
X_6 Mother's Educational Status	.479*	.711	.129	-.296*	.545*	---	-.277*	.550*	.358*	-.081	-.031	.246*	-.108	-.009	-.152*	.241*	.242*	.021
X_7 Comparative Educational Status	.359*	-.088	.171*	.291*	.653*	-.279*	---	.484*	.204*	-.072	.037	-.038	-.125	-.072	-.087	.204*	-.097	.307*
X_8 Family Social Class	.913*	.644*	-.054	.142	.835*	.563*	.448*	---	.480*	-.122	.126	.077	-.191*	-.050	-.231*	.262*	.068	.209*
X_9 Estimated Family Income	.406*	.445*	-.057	-.047	.287*	.284*	.072	.412*	---	-.195*	.127	.116	-.162*	-.072	-.169*	-.062	-.110	.040
X_{10} Family Size	-.149*	-.312*	-.120	.161	-.139*	-.203*	.025	-.152*	-.061	---	.007	.064	.698*	.549*	.540*	.004	.048	-.042
X_{11} Adolescent's Age	.079	.017	.018	.127	-.003	-.079	.068	.119	.021	.007	---	-.077	-.010	-.104	.081	.021	.022	.002
X_{12} Religious Attendance	.157*	.144	-.028	.135	-.147*	.157*	.027	.142*	.198*	-.034	-.090	---	-.073	-.063	-.014	.276*	.328*	.171*
X_{13} Birth Order	-.074	-.141	-.027	.084	-.112	-.160*	.017	-.115	.082	.536*	-.130	.076	---	.776*	.800*	-.102	-.037	-.071
X_{14} No. of Older Brothers	-.141*	-.044	-.022	-.084	-.103	-.196*	.059	-.138*	.017	.303*	-.086	.012	.674*	---	.326*	-.143*	-.100	-.055
X_{15} No. of Older Sisters	.012	-.095	-.036	.152	-.076	-.049	-.043	-.041	.081	.472*	-.105	.097	.796*	.107	---	-.038	.073	-.109
Y_1 Paternal Power	.333*	.064	.055	.081	.353*	.230*	.197*	.378*	.202*	-.138*	-.089	.131	-.055	-.159*	.047	---	.508*	.561*
Y_2 Maternal Power	.109	.111	.178*	.030	.185*	.236*	-.001	.180*	.104	.007	.039	.256*	-.037	-.112	.061	.490*	---	-.428*
Y_3 Comparative Power	.253*	-.028	-.103	.062	.206*	.029	.210*	.237*	.120	-.140*	-.129	.090	-.025	-.057	-.006	.615*	-.386*	---

*$p < .05$

a Coded 1 if employed, 0 if non-employed.

b Includes employed mothers only; for males N = 73, for females N = 74.

c Noncomputable since only employed mothers included for occupational variable.

Table 2

Multiple Regression Results of Determinant Variable With Perceived Paternal and Maternal Power for Male and Female Adolescents

Determinant Variables	Males (N = 147)			Females (N = 149)		
Paternal	b	B	F	b	B	F
Educational Level	3.429	.466	32.777*	2.759	.299	13.735*
Family Income	-1.565	-.312	14.855*	.564	.105	1.691
Religiosity	3.959	.229	9.895*	1.725	.067	.734
Older Brothers	-1.463	-.119	2.731	-2.516	-.131	2.870
	R^2 = .271			R^2 = .157		
Maternal						
Educational Level	2.143	.253	9.182*	1.819	.182	4.903*
Employment Status	.470	.035	.192	2.099	.148	3.549
Family Income	-1.124	-.225	8.403*	.000	.000	.000
Religiosity	4.557	.288	13.326*	4.894	.223	7.789*
	R^2 = .183			R^2 = .126		

*p < .05

Table 3

Multiple Regression Results of Resource Variables and Religiosity With Perceived Comparative Power for Male and Female Adolescents

Determinant Variables	Males (N = 147)			Females (N = 149)		
	b	B	F	b	B	F
Comparative Educational Status	2.378	.294	13.899*	2.006	.201	6.030*
Mother's Employment Status	-2.116	-.153	3.657	-1.029	-.066	.642
Religiosity	.187	.011	.020	-2.347	-.097	1.438
	R^2 = .117			R^2 = .058		

REFERENCES

Bahr, S.J., C. Bowerman, and V. Gecas

1974 "Adolescent perceptions of conjugal power." Social Forces 52 (March):357-367.

Bane, M. J.

1967 Here to Stay: American Families in the Twentieth Century. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Berheide, C. W., S. Berk, and R. Berk

1976 "Household work in the suburbs" The job and its participants." Pacific Sociological Review 19 (October): 491-518.

Blalock, H.

1963 "Correlated independent variables: The problem of multicollinearity." Social Forces 42 (December): 233-237.

Blood, R. O., and D. M. Wolfe

1960 Husbands and Wives. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Bowerman, C. E., and S. J. Bahr

1973 "Conjugal power and adolescent identification with parents." Sociometry 36 (October): 366-377.

Bowerman, C. E., and G. H. Elder, Jr.

1964 "Variations in adolescent perception of family power structure." American Sociological Review 29 (August): 551-567.

Buehler, M. H., A. Weigert, and D. Thomas

1974 "Correlates of conjugal power: A five culture analysis of adolescent perceptions." Journal of Comparative Family Studies 5 (Spring): 5-16.

Centers, R., B. Raven, and A. Rodrigues

1971 "Conjugal power structure: A re-examination." American Sociological Review 36 (April): 264-278.

Christ, C. F.

1966 Econometric Methods and Models. New York: John Wiley.

Cromwell, R. E., and D. H. Olson

1975 Power in Families. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Edwards, J. N., and M. Brauburger

1973 "Exchange and parent-youth conflict." Journal of Marriage and the Family 35 (February): 101-107.

Emerson, R. H.

1962 "Power-dependence relations." American Sociological Review 27 (February): 31-41.

Farkas, G.

1976 "Education, wage rates, and the division of labor between husband and wife." Journal of Marriage and the Family 38 (August): 473-483.

French, J. R., and B. Raven

1959 "The bases of social power." Pp. 150-167 in D. Cartwright (ed.) Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research.

Gecas, V.

1971 "Parental behavior and dimensions of adolescent self-evaluation." Sociometry 34 (December): 466-482.

Hallenbeck, P. N.

1966 "An analysis of power dynamics in marriages." Journal of Marriage and the Family 28 (May): 200-203.

Heer, D. M.

1958 "Dominance and the working wife." Social Forces 36 (May): 341-347.

1963a "The measurement and bases of family power: An overview." Marriage and Family Living 25 (May): 133-139.

1963b "The measurement and bases of family power: A reply." Marriage and Family Living 25 (November): 477-478.

Hoffman, L. W.

1960 "Effects of the employment of mothers on parental power relations and division of labor tasks." Marriage and Family Living 22 (February): 27-35.

Hollingshead, A. B.

1957 Two-Factor Index of Social Position. New Haven: Privately printed.

Ihinger, M.

1975 "The referee role and norms of equity: A contribution toward a theory of sibling conflict." Journal of Marriage and the Family 37 (August): 515-524.

Kasadra, J. D., and W. Shih

1977 "Optimal bias in ridge regression approaches to multicollinearity." Sociological Methods and Research 5 (May): 461-470.

Komarovsky, M.

1962 Blue-Collar Marriage. New York: Random House.

Maccoby, E., and C. Jacklin

1974 The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press.

McDonald, G. W.

1977a "Family power: reflection and direction." Pacific Sociological Review 20 (October): 607-621.

1977b "Parental identification by the adolescent: A social power approach." Journal of Marriage and the Family 39 (November): 705-719.

Nachmias, D. and C. Nachmias

1976 Research Methods in the Social Sciences. New York: St. Martins Press.

Olson, D. H.

1969 "The measurement of family power by self-report and behavioral methods." Journal of Marriage and the Family 31 (August): 545-550.

Olson, D. H., R. Cromwell, and D. Klein

1975 "Beyond family power." Pp. 235-240 in R. Cromwell and D. Olson (eds.), Power in Families. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Oppenheimer, V.K.

1977 "The sociology of women's economic role in the family." American Sociological Review 42 (June): 387-406.

Parsons, T. and R. F. Bales

1955 Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Raven, B. H.

1965 "Social influence and power." Pp. 371-382 in I. D. Steiner and M. Fishbein (eds.), Current Studies in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Raven, B. H., R. Centers, and A. Rodrigues

1975 "The bases of conjugal power." Pp. 217-232 in R. Cromwell and D. Olson (eds.), Power in Families. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Rodman, H.

1967 "Marital power in France, Greece, Yugoslavia and the United States: A cross-sectional discussion." Journal of Marriage and the Family 29 (May): 320-324.

1972 "Marital power and the theory of 'resources in cultural context'." Journal of Comparative Family Studies 3 (Spring): 50-67.

Rollins, B. C., and S. Bahr

1976 "A theory of power relationships in marriage." Journal of Marriage and the Family 38 (November): 619-627.

Rollins, R. C. and D. L. Thomas

1975 "A theory of parental power and child compliance." Pp. 38-60 in R. Cromwell and D. Olson (eds.), Power in Families. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Safilios-Rothschild, C.

1970 "The study of family power structure: A review 1960-1969." Journal of Marriage and the Family 32 (November): 539-551.

Smith, T. E.

1970 "Foundations of parental influence upon adolescents: An application of social power theory." American Sociological Review 35 (October): 860-872.

1977 "An empirical comparison of potential determinants of parental authority." Journal of Marriage and the Family 39 (February): 153-164.

Thibaut, J. W. and H. Kelley

1959 The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Turk, J. L.

1975 "Uses and abuses of family power." Pp. 80-94 in R. Cromwell and D. Olson (eds.), Power in Families. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Turk, J. L. and N. W. Bell

1972 "Measuring power in families." Journal of Marriage and the Family 34 (May): 215-222.